



PATENT  
0459-0490P

IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Lorenzo Williams                      Conf.: 8775  
Appl. No.: 09/680,471                      Group: 1743  
Filed: October 6, 2000                      Examiner: Y.G. GAKH  
For: A METHOD FOR SYNTHESIS, SEPARATION AND  
SCREENING OF A PLURALITY OF COMPOUNDS  
IN THE SAME BULK OF A STATIONARY PHASE  
(AS AMENDED)

STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

January 22, 2004

Sir:

In the Interview on December 22, 2003, Applicant's representative presented arguments that the combination of Mehta '590 and Frank fail to discuss all the elements of the claimed invention and that there is no motivation to combine the references. The Examiner stated that in light of the amendments filed on October 14, 2003 and entered by the RCE filed on December 10, 2003, the secondary reference Frank was not necessary for making a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, the remaining

discussion was focused on distinguishing Mehta '590 from the present invention.

The Examiner suggested distinguishing Mehta '590 by amending the claims to a three-dimensional bulk, with an x, y and z-axis, as disclosed in Figures 3 and 4. Alternatively, the Examiner suggested amending the claims to recite a two directional migration as disclosed in the last paragraph on page 9 of the specification.

Applicant incorporated the Examiner's suggested amendment of a 3-D bulk into claims filed with the Supplemental Amendment submitted January 14, 2004.


Lastly, in the interview, Applicant's representative and Examiner discussed whether Mehta '590 disclosed or suggested "sequential synthesis". Applicant's representative argued that Mehta '590 fails to suggest sequential synthesis. It was agreed that Mehta '590 discloses sequential screening, however, Applicant's representative argued that one of ordinary skill in the art would not modify Mehta '590 from doing sequential screening to doing sequential synthesis. The Examiner agreed, but pointed to column 5, lines 23 to 33 for disclosing DNA sequencing. The Examiner stated that DNA sequencing would result in sequential synthesis of a biological product. The Examiner maintained that Mehta '590 discloses sequential synthesis.

Appl. No. 09/680,471


If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
Gerald M. Murphy, Jr., #28,977

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

  
GMM/KJR/jao  
0459-0490P

(Rev. 09/30/03)